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Abstract

We present a computational model exploring goal-directed deployment of attention during object tracking. Once selected, objects are tracked in parallel, but serial attention can be directed to an object that is visually crowded and in danger of being lost. An attended object’s future position can be extrapolated from its past motion trajectory, allowing the object to be tracked even when it is briefly occluded. Using the model, we demonstrate that the difficulty of tracking through occlusions increases with the number of objects because they compete for serial attention.
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Introduction

Our visual experience of the world is rich and exhilarating, full of a wide variety of objects that move either predictably or erratically. Making sense of what we see requires an ability to follow these objects over time, sometimes tracking two, three, or more at once. The criticality of this capability is reflected in the existence of low-level mechanisms in the vision system that can follow multiple objects in parallel, seemingly without explicit attention. However, when the paths of objects intersect or when one object occludes another, these mechanisms are insufficient, requiring that we attend to an object to disambiguate it from others.

What guides our attention toward any one particular object in the visual field? There is a considerable amount of literature that seeks to answer this question by appealing to visual salience (Borji & Itti, 2013). That work emphasizes contrast effects in the early visual system that draw our eyes to regions of fast motion, bright lights, and flashes of color. The target phenomenon described by that literature is goal-free, visual perception—that is, where a person would look if told to freely examine an image. The corresponding results say little about top-down influences on visual attention, such as when a person adopts a goal to track an object over time.

Fortunately, there is a task that lets us study goal-directed, visual attention under exactly these conditions. Experiments on multiple-object tracking (MOT) have people distinguish one or more targets from a larger set of identical distractors as they move across an empty background (Pylyshyn & Storm, 1988). In these studies, the only identifying characteristic of each object is its motion history. As a result, the low-level mechanisms that maintain the identity of objects in parallel are taxed, which lets researchers study their limits and therefore determine the conditions that require visual attention.

We know, for instance, that when targets come close to other objects, they tend to draw attention (Iordanescu, Grabowekey, & Suzuki, 2009; Zelinsky & Todor, 2010). This effect of crowding does not hold when distractors are clustered together, so the goal to track the targets must play a role in protecting them from possible confusion with the other objects. It also appears that the difficulty of MOT increases when multiple targets are crowded simultaneously (Srivastava & Vul, 2016). These findings suggest that visual attention is deployed serially and can only disambiguate one threatened target at a time.

In this paper, we present a computational model that accounts for one of the roles that attention plays in object tracking. Our research builds on previous work by Bello, Bridewell, and Wasylyshyn (2016) that assumed attention is serially deployed to initially encode targets, after which a parallel process that does not require attention exclusively handles object tracking. In their model, the interaction between attention and the tracking goal was limited to keeping visual attention on the targets. The model’s ability to track targets broke down when the targets’ previous positions were insufficient for distinguishing them from other nearby objects (e.g., when the objects moved quickly or were close to each other). In the updated model presented here, the processes for serial shifts of attention are refined and contribute throughout the task.

Specifically, the updated model detects when objects flagged as targets are visually crowded and, in response, directs attention to them. Sustained attention on an object enables the construction of its motion trajectory, which can be used to predict its future position. This extra information gives the model the ability to follow a target through an occlusion event, where another object overlaps or covers the target. Because attention is deployed serially, only one target can be tracked in this way at a time. As a result, when two targets are crowded, they vie for attention and the one that is not selected remains in danger of being lost by the parallel, tracking process.
We claim that tracking through occlusion is facilitated by goal-directed deployment of attention to the target involved. We support this claim by providing a computational model of visual attention described in the next section. Briefly, this model requires that crowded targets compete for attention and its associated computational benefits. To test the model, we apply it to stimuli drawn from the work by Luu and Howe (2015) showing that people are better at predicting target positions from past trajectories when there are fewer targets. We find that the model accounts for these results and is in accordance with a broader range of findings in the literature.

Computational Model of Visual Attention

The computational model is implemented using ARCADIA (Bridewell & Bello, 2016a), a cognitive system designed for exploring the role of attention. The system operates in cycles that correspond to 25 ms of activity in human perception. On each cycle components, which carry out all the computation in a model, place their results in a location called accessible content. ARCADIA uses an attentional strategy to select one of these results as a focus of attention, which directs processing in a subset of components. On the subsequent cycle, the components receive sense data (e.g., a video frame), accessible content, and the focus of attention as input and produce the next collection of accessible content as output.

Like other models built using ARCADIA, this model of visual attention consists of a set of components and an attentional strategy. Many of the components included in the current model were previously described by Bello, Bridewell, and Wasylslyshyn (2016). Looking at Figure 1, these include image segmenter, object locator, object-file binder, and vstm (which implements visual short-term memory). In the rest of this section, we summarize these components, mention changes to object locator, detail the new components, and discuss the attentional strategy.

Beginning at the bottom of Figure 1, image segmenter polls a sensor that provides one frame of video input each cycle. The component then outputs a set of proto-objects, hypotheses for the locations of objects (Rensink, 2000), based on closed-contour regions in the frame. For proto-objects to lead to object representations, they must receive attention. To this end, a set of highlighters, described later in this section, proposes one or more candidate proto-objects for the focus of attention. If ARCADIA focuses on one of these candidates, then the object file binder constructs an object file, which is based on the ideas of Treisman and Gelade (1980) and is a representation that binds together any visual features found at the proto-object’s location (e.g., color profile, size). If that object file receives attention, then the vstm component stores it in memory.

Improvements to the Parallel Aspects of Tracking

If tracking objects always required attention, then it would take four ARCADIA cycles (100 ms) to go from visual input to representing a single object in vstm. To update that object’s location would take the same amount of time. Even accounting for the ability to pipeline parts of the process, two cycles (50 ms) are required for shifting covert attention and representing an object. The timing needed to serially update the location of multiple objects, which is based on evidence from visual search in humans (Wolfe, 2003), is unrealistic. Therefore, the model needs a way to track objects in parallel.

To address this need, the model includes tracking functionality in object locator. In earlier ARCADIA models, this component kept location information up-to-date by matching object files in vstm to the proto-objects nearest to each object’s last known location. This approach was inspired by Pylyshyn’s (1989) proposal that roughly four objects can be tracked in parallel using visual indices and by Dawson’s (1991) work that identified a nearest-neighbor constraint in apparent motion, which is likely related to tracking.

In this model, we refine object locator to provide an account of Dawson’s constraint based on newer results in visual processing. This new implementation generates a two-dimensional priority map (Fecteau & Munoz, 2006; Bisley & Goldberg, 2010), with enhanced regions at each tracked object’s last known location and suppressed regions around them. Evidence for this treatment of spatial regions...
Figure 3. A: An occlusion event. B: Part of a priority map, updated with an attended object’s predicted location, shown as the off-center darker red circle.

comes from early work on multifocal attention (Castiello & Umiltà, 1992) and center-surround suppression (Tsotsos et al., 1995; Desimone & Duncan, 1995). To track objects in parallel, each object file in vstm is matched to the proto-object that most overlaps its corresponding enhanced region on the priority map. Figure 2B shows an example of such a map with enhanced red and yellow circles and suppressed outer green rings. Importantly, if two tracked objects are near each other, one object’s suppressed region may overlap another object’s enhanced region (see the two lower circles in Figure 2B), resulting in a smaller enhanced region and a greater chance of a tracked object being lost.

Goal-Directed Attention in Tracking

Adopting a goal to track specific moving objects, or targets, alters how attention is deployed. In particular, attention can be drawn to a target when there is a risk that the parallel, tracking mechanisms could fail for that object. For instance, as suggested by Figure 3A, when multiple objects overlap, they look like a single proto-object. After those objects move apart, it is unclear which one, if any, was previously a target. This problem arises because following a target through an occlusion event requires more information than only its previous location. On these occasions, the model uses an attended target’s recent motion history to extrapolate its future position in order to track it through occlusions. We conjecture that serial attention is required for this process because it involves binding trajectory information and the corresponding extrapolated position to a particular object file.

Goal-directed deployment of attention is assisted by the highlighters mentioned earlier in this section. Recall that these components propose proto-objects as candidates for attention and therefore determine which objects will be stored in vstm and tracked by object locator. There are three highlighters, one of which is task specific and the other two are generally important for tracking. First, color highlighter is used to identify targets and queries about objects in the multiple-object tracking videos, indicated by objects changing color in the videos. The other two highlighters propose proto-objects corresponding to currently tracked objects. The crowding highlighter proposes each tracked object as a candidate for attention and includes as information the distance from each one to the nearest other proto-object. This value provides a measure of crowding and is based on the finding that tracked objects draw attention when they are visually crowded and in danger of being lost (Iordanescu, Grabowecky, & Suzuki, 2009; Zelinsky & Todor, 2010).

The maintenance highlighter proposes maintaining attention on the object that was last in focus. If attention remains on the same object over a period of time, this component computes its motion trajectory from location changes over a window of two to three cycles. Additionally, maintenance highlighter detects occlusion events, where the focused object is partially or completely occluded by another object (e.g., Figure 3A). When the attended object is occluded, the component predicts the focused object’s position based on its recorded trajectory. This information lets object locator update its priority map to enhance the object’s predicted location (the off-center, red circle in Figure 3B), improving its ability to continue tracking the object after the occlusion event ends.

The final component, target object guesser, records the model’s responses in the multiple-object tracking task. This component reports whether the model considers a probed item to be a target (tracked) or a distractor.

The model’s attentional strategy is a priority list over the elements in accessible content. The highest priority is to focus on new object-files for storage in vstm. Below that, the strategy prefers proto-objects, which enables encoding them into object files. The preferences for proto-objects are ordered with color highlighter first, which ensures that targets are initially encoded and that probes are noticed when objects change color. The next highest priority is to maintain attention on a crowded target, one whose distance to the nearest other proto-object has fallen below a crowding distance threshold. The third highest priority is to attend to whichever target is the most crowded—the one with the lowest crowding distance. This ordering enables goal-directed deployment of attention to objects that are in danger of being lost, and it handles competition between simultaneously crowded objects. Once an attended object is endangered, attention will stay on it until the distance to nearby proto-objects exceeds the crowding threshold even if other targets are also in danger.

In summary, the model consists of eight components (Figure 1), four of which are new and one of which was substantially changed. Two components are task specific: target object guesser and color highlighter. The model includes three free parameters, two in object locator1 and

---

1 Object locator constructs a priority map in three steps. First, following Bouma’s law for visual crowding (Whitney & Levi, 2011), object locator generates Marr wavelets centered at each tracked object’s location, scaled so that the sizes of the suppressive fields increase as those objects enter the periphery. Second, since untracked stimuli produce visual crowding at a weaker rate than tracked stimuli (Whitney & Levi, 2011), for each proto-object, we include the negative component of a wavelet whose amplitude is set to 20% of that for tracked objects. Third, Holcombe, Chen, and Howe (2014) report a general cost for having more tracked objects. We account for this effect with long-range suppression in the visual field, implemented as a constant value (0.04 in the model) subtracted from the entire visual field outside of each tracked object’s enhanced region.
At the beginning of the study, the motion speeds for each participant were calibrated to determine the speed where the participant achieved 75% accuracy. Calibration occurred separately for two and four targets and used only predictable motions. Afterwards, participants were tested over 120 randomly generated trials, 30 in each condition (number of targets × motion predictability), with conditions interleaved.

Luu and Howe reported data from 15 participants. Their results found, unsurprisingly, that tracking two targets was easier than tracking four, as indicated by a much higher speed when calibrating for two targets. Importantly, they observed a significant interaction between the number of targets and motion predictability. Pairwise comparisons indicated that predictable motions were easier than unpredictable motions for two targets but not for four targets. Luu and Howe proposed that object tracking is sensitive to motion trajectories for two targets, but less so for four targets, which is in line with findings by Fencsik, Klieger, and Horowitz (2007).

**Model**

To evaluate the computational model using Luu and Howe’s experiment, we randomly generated 120 trial videos each for 15 virtual “participants” (the model was the same in each case, so only the trial videos varied). The videos matched the description in the paper as closely as possible with five minor exceptions.

1. There was no fixation cross, but center fixation was enforced in the model.
2. It was impossible to match to the original study’s display size (15° x 15°) because the model does not perceive the display from a quantifiable viewing distance. However, the study’s proportion of disk size to display size was maintained.
3. Videos were constrained to begin and end with all disks at least one radius apart (such constraints are common but were not mentioned in the paper).
4. To save simulation time, disks were highlighted for a shorter duration.
5. Disk colors differed from the original, which was incidental.

The model’s crowding distance threshold was 1.6 diameters, meaning an attended target would need to be at least this distance away from all other disks before the model could swap attention to another target.

**Results**

The calibration phase of the experiment differed slightly from Luu and Howe’s approach. Because the model was held constant across virtual participants, we calibrated the speeds only once. We found that to ensure roughly equivalent accuracy close to 75%, the speeds were eight pixels per cycle for two targets and four pixels per cycle for four targets.

Figure 4 displays the results for each condition. A two-way ANOVA with set size (two vs. four targets) and predictability was conducted. There was a significant main
effect of predictability, F(1,56) = 14.3, p < .001, indicating that accuracy was higher with predictable trajectories. There was also a significant interaction between set size and predictability, F(1,56) = 4.8, p = .032, indicating that the effect of predictability was greater for two targets. Unpaired comparisons confirmed that predictability had a significant effect on accuracy for two targets, M = 79.8% (predictable) vs. 68.9% (unpredictable), t(28) = 3.91, p < .001, but not for four targets, M = 75.3% (predictable) vs. 72.4% (unpredictable), t(28) = 1.23, p = .230.

Discussion

The model’s results matched the human data, which suggests that the model accounts for two key findings. First, as evidenced in the speed discrepancies during the calibration phase, tracking two targets was easier for the model and for people than tracking four targets. Notably, increasing the number of targets increases both the number of possible occlusion events and the potential for simultaneous crowding. These effects are important for the model, which explains errors as resulting in part from failures to attend to targets during occlusion. As a result, slowing object movement reduces the number of occlusions and contributes to the ability to successfully track targets.

The second and more important finding is that the model more accurately tracked objects that moved predictably than those that moved unpredictably, but only for two targets. To understand this, we have to describe why the model could track some objects through occlusion events when the trajectories were unpredictable. Recall that objects changed direction only every 300–600 ms, or 12–24 cycles in ARCADIA, and that the model calculates motion trajectories over a 2 cycle window. As long as a target maintains course through the occlusion and the two cycles before it, tracking should work perfectly. In practice, this means that the unpredictable trajectories only disrupt a small proportion of occlusion events.

As an explanation, the model suggests that there are two sources of error: missed occlusion events and unpredictable trajectories for attended occlusions. With four targets there are more missed occlusion events due to simultaneous crowding than with two, so proportionally that has a larger effect on the error rate than the unpredictable trajectories. This difference explains why unpredictable trajectories are more harmful with two targets than with four, and the combination of this with the overall small proportion of occlusion events disrupted by unpredictable trajectories explains the lack of a significant effect with four targets.

General Discussion

The model demonstrates the critical role of goal-directed visual attention in object tracking. Although attention is not always needed to update target locations, it provides key information to aid in tracking targets that are in danger of being lost due to visual crowding. In the reported model, attention provides a target’s motion trajectory, which enables tracking through occlusions.

One explanation for how people track multiple objects is provided by the multifocal view of attention (Cavanagh & Alvarez, 2005). Proponents of this view have argued for two theoretical limits on attention. First, attention may be a limited resource that must be distributed among targets (Holcombe & Chen, 2012), which makes tracking more difficult when targets are crowded simultaneously and must compete for attention (Srivastava & Vul, 2016). Second, attention may be subject to spatial interference between neighboring targets (Franconeri, Jonathan, & Scimeca, 2010), which makes tracking more difficult when targets are nearer to each other (Shim, Alvarez, & Jian, 2008; Holcombe, Chen, & Howe, 2014).

The reported model offers a competing explanation that distinguishes between serial attention to a single object, which is used to bind features and compute motion trajectories; and parallel enhancement of multiple object-locations, which is used to track objects. These separate mechanisms account for both apparent limits described above. First, tracking difficulty increases when targets are simultaneously crowded because they compete for the serial focus of attention. Second, difficulty increases when targets are near each other because the parallel tracking process uses center-surround suppression, with an enhanced region and a surrounding suppressed region at each target’s location. When two targets are close such that one’s suppressed region overlaps the other’s enhanced region, the enhanced region shrinks and there is a greater chance of losing the target. Additionally, difficulty increases with the number of targets and with object speed (Alvarez & Franconeri, 2007) because these manipulations increase the frequency of events where targets are simultaneously crowded or targets interfere with each other.

Although there are other computational models that have been applied to MOT, the reported model provides a novel explanation. Oksama and Hyönä (2008) relied solely on serial attention and Kazanovich and Borisyuk (2006) relied entirely on multifocal attention. Srivastava and Vul’s (2016) Bayesian, multifocal model is similar to ours in that it distributes attention to visually crowded targets, which lets it predict greater tracking difficulty when targets are crowded simultaneously. However, their model makes no link between attentional distribution and computing motion trajectories. Additionally, the model cannot account for spatial interference between targets. Finally, their model is disconnected from video input, and it abstracts away the underlying correspondence problem.

In this paper, we demonstrated the role that goals may play in object tracking. In particular, the model’s implicit goal to track targets enhances its ability by influencing where it attends. That is, selecting an object as a target recruits processes that monitor crowding and maintain focus when that target is endangered. Additionally, we note that the information made available by attending to an object is a form of indirect influence by the goal on visual processing (e.g., during the creation of the priority map). In the future we intend to explore other cases where the goal-directed
deployment of attention interacts with perception and eventually with motor control.
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